

## **REMARK/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants respectfully present the following comments and arguments in response to the Office Action mailed March 3, 2006.

### **Restriction Requirement**

In the Office Action, restriction to one of the following two identified inventions was required, under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

- I. Polyvinyl alcohol-based film (claims 1-12).
- II. Method for treating a surface of a polyvinyl alcohol-based film (claims 13-27).

Provisional election of the invention of Group I was made during a telephone conversation between the Examiner and Applicants' undersigned attorney of record, James R. Brueggemann, on February 24, 2006. Applicants affirm this election and now cancel claims 13-27, which were drawn to the non-elected invention of Group II. Applicants, of course, reserve the right to file a divisional application directed to the non-elected invention of Group II. Applicants also affirm the named inventorship for claims 1-12.

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended the Title of the Invention to reflect the withdrawal of claims directed to a method for treating a polyvinyl alcohol-based film.

### **Rewriting of Allowable Claims in Independent Form**

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as allegedly anticipated by Reytjens (U. S. Patent 6,939,612 B2) or, alternately, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Tanabe et al. (U. S. Patent 5,626,910). In addition, claims 5-12 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The indication of allowable subject matter is acknowledged with appreciation. The Examiner states that such claims are deemed allowable because the prior art does not disclose a polyvinyl alcohol-based film incorporating the recited oxygen-to-carbon ratio or the recited polarizer.

By this Amendment, Applicants have rewritten allowable claims 9 and 12 in independent form, incorporating all of the features of their parent claim 1, which has now been canceled.

In addition, claims 2-6 have been amended to change their dependency from rejected (and now canceled) claim 1 to allowable amended claim 12, and new claims 28-32 have been added to the application, depending from allowable amended claim 9. The features recited in these new claims 28-32 correspond to the features recited in original claims 2-4, 6, and 7, respectively. Original claims 7 and 8 have been canceled, as now redundant.

Thus, 14 claims are presented for reconsideration, including allowable independent claim 12 and its dependent claims 2-6, and allowable independent claim 9 and its dependent claims 10, 11, and 28-32. All of these claims should be allowable without the need for further substantive examination.

This application should now be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' undersigned attorney of record might expedite the prosecution of this application, he is invited to call at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

  
James R. Bruggemann  
Registration No. 28,286

Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP  
333 South Hope Street, 48th Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
(213) 620-1780 x4156